

a charter of liberties, the belief in fundamental written guarantees of rights and privileges has become a treasured inheritance on both sides of the Atlantic. Unknown or unpracticed in many parts of the world, the concept of individual rights guaranteed by law is a jewel in the crown of British history. Other documents written since the Magna Carta, and comprising the unwritten English Constitution, including the Petition of Right, 1628, and the English Bill of Rights, 1689, have also found new life on distant shores in the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights. And the concepts of "habeas corpus," presentment and trial juries, "just compensation," and the right against self-incrimination, all pillars of American jurisprudence, migrated to the United States from England and English law.

To my mind, however, one of the greatest legacies bestowed upon the United States by these generations of British lawmakers is in establishing control over the power of the purse in elected officials of the people, rather than in the executive. Seven hundred and two years ago, in 1297, Edward I reluctantly agreed to the "Confirmation of the Charters," promising not to levy taxes without the common consent of the realm.

Parliament took on its original form during the reign of Edward I, who has been called the father of Parliament. Parliament divided into the House of Commons and the House of Lords along about 1339, 1341–42, during the reign of Edward III, who reigned from 1327 to 1377, a total of 50 years.

Paired with this spending authority came the right to audit how funds had been expended. These powers of appropriation and audit, the fraternal twins of legislative might, shaped and tested by British experience, were united by the American Founding Fathers in a single paragraph of article I, section 9, of the U.S. Constitution. It states that, "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time." And so it is this sentence, together with the very first section of article 1, which invests in the Senate and the House of Representatives their broad scope to check the power of the Chief Executive and defend the interests of their various constituencies.

For this, as in so many things, I give thanks to my English forbearers, who shed their blood at the point of the sword in wresting from tyrannical monarchs the control of the power over the purse. That struggle lasted for hundreds of years, until finally, in 1689, under the English Bill of Rights, it was guaranteed. As for William of Orange and Mary, who assumed the joint rule over the British people, Parliament re-

quired that they accede to and agree to the Declaration of Rights, which had been drawn up in February of 1689. Once they agreed, then they were crowned joint monarchs. In December of that year, the English Declaration of Rights was put into statute form and designated the English Bill of Rights.

This is a pearl beyond price, and one which I hope to pass down unblemished to my descendants. Never again, after that English Bill of Rights had been put into statute form, would Kings levy taxes—excise or other taxes—upon the British people without the approval, the assent and consent of Parliament. I have fought with every ounce of energy that I could muster against such mutations of the legacy passed down to this country through a thousand years of blood and English history as the constitutional amendment to balance the budget and the line-item veto.

Our common past has built a history of cooperation between the British and the American people that has always prevailed over our differences. In this century, our sons, brothers, and fathers have stood shoulder to shoulder against common enemies from the battlegrounds of world wars to conflicts in the Persian Gulf and in the Balkans. Together, we have stood against the Soviet bear. We have stood fast through changes of governments and shifts in political power. While not always smooth, just as relations between family members are not always smooth, Anglo-American relations have weathered bigger storms than Bosnia, Kosovo, NATO expansion, and differences in how to approach the problem of global climate change.

Our blood ties are stronger than the vast and deep ocean of waters that are between us. And those unbreakable bonds will see us through to the next century and beyond, because we are brothers made so through the parenthood of historical experience. Exchanges like those fostered by the British-American Parliamentary Group are the nectar, the ambrosia, that sweetens and sustains the close ties between our nations. I look forward to this week's opportunity to join again at the flower of good fellowship.

I second the words of Winston Churchill, who said in a speech in the House of Commons on August 20, 1940:

The British Empire and the United States will have to be somewhat mixed up together in some of their affairs for the mutual and general advantage. For my own part looking out upon the future, I do not view the process with any misgivings. I could not stop it if I wished; no one can stop it. Like the Mississippi, it just keeps rolling along. Let it roll, let it roll on full flood, inexorable, irresistible, benignant, to broader lands and better days.

Senator STEVENS, our other colleagues who have agreed to join with us at the Greenbrier, and my wife Erma and I welcome Lord and Lady

Jopling. My wife and I were in England—in York, as a matter of fact—in August of the year before last, on the day that Princess Diana was killed, and on which we returned to the United States after meeting with the British-U.S. Parliamentary Group. I had the pleasure of chairing the group when we Democrats were in control of the Senate. On that occasion, I took the members of the British group down to the Greenbrier, in Greenbrier County at White Sulphur Springs. We enjoyed it. We all look forward to going there again.

Again, I welcome Lord and Lady Jopling, and the British members of this year's exchange.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. As I understand it, we are in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THOMAS. I can speak for approximately 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I want to talk about a bill introduced on Friday on Social Security in which I and other sponsors were involved. I mention it because it seems to me that it is one of the issues that is most important. I just came back from Wyoming, and I talked with folks about issues. Social Security is one of those that is, of course, a top priority.

Obviously, most everyone knows Social Security has to be changed if we are to fulfill the goals all of us want, and that is to protect Social Security for those who are now beneficiaries, to keep it going for those who are now paying in and will pay in for many years and can then expect to be beneficiaries. Those are the things that have to happen, and there have to be changes to cause that to happen.

We have a rapidly aging population. When we started Social Security, there were some 30 people working for every one who was drawing benefits. An individual paid \$30 a year into Social Security in the 1930s. Then we got to where there were five people working for every one who was a beneficiary. Now I believe it is less than three, and we will soon be to the point where there will be one individual working for every one person drawing benefits. We have to make changes. Of course, people are living longer, so that also brings new demands on the programs.

What are the options? There are several that are fairly obvious, some of which are not particularly popular. A tax increase: We already pay 12.5 percent of what we make into Social Security. That is a rather high percentage. For many people that is the largest tax they pay. So tax increases are not particularly a good option.

We could cut benefits. I do not think people generally want to cut benefits. There may be some changes made in benefits because people are living longer and there are changes in our lives.

The third alternative is one which I think probably has the most appeal, and that is to get a higher rate of return on the money we are putting into Social Security and have been putting into it for some time. That is the part of the bill we have introduced.

It is a bicameral, bipartisan bill that enhances the program through private accounts. It will take a portion of the money you and I put into Social Security—I believe it is about 2 percent of the 12.5 percent—and that becomes a personal account for each person. It can be invested then at the direction of that account owner. It can be invested in equities, stocks, it can be invested in bonds, or it can be invested in a combination of those things. It will be invested by a private investor such as the Federal employees program is now. You will have a broad choice. The owners will not be doing the investing, but they will be choosing the kinds of investment they want.

This can then accumulate as a nest egg for the owner. If the owner is unfortunate not to live long enough to receive the benefits that will accrue to his or her estate, it will be the owner's.

We have been talking a lot about a safety box, some way to take the money that comes in to Social Security and ensure it is used for that purpose and not spent for some other purpose or not loaned to the general fund. This probably and certainly is the best way to do that.

I make the point that we are not looking at total privatization. Some people accuse us of that. That is not the case. It is a partial privatization. It puts money in so it can earn more than it has earned in the past. As most people understand, excess in the trust funds now has to be invested in Government securities. It has a relatively lower return, lower than if you and I invested those securities. This is a change for improvement.

We need to work on the lockbox. We tried five times to pass the lockbox legislation to have some way to ensure Social Security funds coming in are not expended for other things, and that they are, indeed, kept for the purpose of maintaining and strengthening Social Security. That is what we want to do.

There are some other good features of the plan. It is more progressive. It

guarantees larger benefits for low-income workers. It increases widow benefits, which has been unfair in the past. It repeals earnings limitations, if you are a beneficiary and choose to continue to work. In, in fact, there are several incentives for continuing to work. Since people are living longer and are healthier, there is more reason and opportunity and willingness to work.

This bill is designed to protect current retirees. Current beneficiaries will not be affected by the changes. It is aimed primarily at young people who are beginning to pay into the program. Almost all young people 20 years old say: We probably won't get anything out of this; all we will do is pay. That is very unfair, and we can change that.

There is a great deal of talk about doing something with Social Security, but, frankly, the administration and our friends on the other side generally have not come up with a plan. Now we have a bipartisan plan which is before the Senate. We can do something that will make the changes we propose to make and which are good for the American people.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Iowa is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY pertaining to the introduction of S. 1390 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business now closed.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 1555, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill (H.R. 1555) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intel-

ligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, frankly, this is a very important debate that starts today on a very important bill, H.R. 1555, and there is a very important amendment that we will allude to and talk about this afternoon with reference to reorganizing the Department of Energy in ways that have been suggested by many in order to minimize security risks in the future and maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of the department of the Department of Energy that works on the nuclear weapons installations, facilities, and research within that department.

I note the presence of Senator LEVIN on the floor, and I want to be as accommodating as he would like in terms of his using time. I am prepared to speak a lot today about history and the like, but whenever he is ready, I will be glad to yield to him.

I am going to start today's debate by inserting into the RECORD a June 30, 1999, column from the Wall Street Journal, written by Paul C. Light. He is a senior fellow at the Brookings Institute and the author of "The True Size of Government," Brookings, 1999.

I ask unanimous consent that that article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOOSE LIPS AND BLOATED BUREAUCRACIES

How can Washington prevent future security breaches like the one at the Los Alamos nuclear laboratory? Last week former Sen. Warren Rudman, chairman of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board and head of a special investigating panel, recommended a "new semi-autonomous agency" within the Department of Energy that would have "a clear mission, streamlined bureaucracy and drastically simplified lines of authority and accountability."

Mr. Rudman is right to focus on the structure of the department, not the failures of one or two key bureaucrats. For the Energy Department has never had more layers of management than it does now—and its leadership has never been more disconnected from what is happening at its bottom. Secretary Bill Richardson last week appointed a security "czar," Gen. Eugene Habiger, to serve as the fulcrum for a newly rationalized chain of command. But the czar may merely add one more layer to a meandering, mostly unlinked collection of overseers who can easily evade responsibility when things go wrong.

At the department's founding in 1979, its secretary, deputy secretary, undersecretary and assistant secretary "compartments" contained 10 layers and 56 senior executives. By 1998 those four compartments had thickened to 18 layers and 143 senior executives, including an assortment of chiefs of staff and other alter-ego deputies who fill in whenever their bosses are out.

The problem in such overlaid, top-heavy organizations is not a lack of information on possible wrongdoing. Lots of people knew about the vulnerabilities at Los Alamos. The problem is finding someone who is